

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/937,587	09/27/2001	Sundar J. Rajan	54676US002	2684	
32692	7590 06/15/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
3M INNOV	ATIVE PROPERTIES	CHEVALIER,	CHEVALIER, ALICIA ANN		
PO BOX 334	 -		ARTIBUT	PAPER NUMBER	
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NOMBER	
			1772		

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		_	ι	б			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/937,587	RAJAN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Alicia Chevalier	1772				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reg ly within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT e, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 M	<u>1ay 2004</u> .					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-36 is/are pending in the ap	plication.					
4	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>20-36</u> is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 7-19</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application	on Papers						
9)[] 1	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)[] 7	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc	epted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •				
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ <i>A</i>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. & 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).				
_	☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	. promy and or or or or or					
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.					
:	2. Certified copies of the priority document	•	olication No.				
;	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •					
	application from the International Bureau	=	G				
* Se	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not re	eceived.				
Attachment((s)						
	of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sur					
	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/i	Mail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	No(s)/Mail Date 3/26/04.	6) \(\sum \) Other:					

Ale

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

Request for Continued Examination

- 1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.53 (d) filed on May 18, 2004 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
- 2. Claims 1-4 and 7-36 are pending in the application, claims 20-36 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 5 and 6 have been cancelled.
- 3. Amendments to the claims, filed on May 18, 2004, have been entered in the above-identified application.

NEW REJECTIONS

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. Claims 1-4 and 7-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lu (U.S. Patent No. 5,670,096).

Lu discloses a signage article (retroreflective article, title) comprising a substrate (array microlenses, col. 5, line 25 and figure 2) comprising a noncellulosic organic polymer surface (col. 9, lines 20-34), a radiation cured coating (spacing layer, col. 5, line 25 and figure 2) cross linked by exposure radiation selected from the group consisting of ultraviolet radiation, visible

Art Unit: 1772

radiation, electron beam radiation, and combinations thereof disposed on the noncellulosic organic polymeric surface (col. 7, lines 53-66 and claim 2) and a marking material (ink, col. 5, lines 39-40) disposed on the radiation cured coating (figure 2).

In the instant case, Lu does not explicitly teach the properties wherein the marking material is not substantially removed from the signage article upon wiping the marking material with gasoline for five cycles, ten cycles, or twenty cycles, upon abrading the marking material for 1000 scrub cycles, or upon applying a pressure sensitive adhesive-coated tape to the marking material under thumb pressure and removing it. Also, Lu does not explicitly teach the properties wherein the radiation cured coating is not substantially removed from the signage article upon wiping the marking material with gasoline for five cycles, upon abrading the marking material for 1000 scrub cycles, or upon applying a pressure sensitive adhesive-coated tape to the marking material under thumb pressure and removing it.

However, it has been held that where claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation has been established and the burden of proof is shifted to applicant to show that prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess characteristics of claimed products where the rejection is based on inherency under 35 USC 102. Therefore, the *prime facie* case can be rebutted by *evidence* showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product. MPEP 2112.01.

Therefore, in addition to the above disclosed limitations, the presently claimed properties would have inherently been present because Lu discloses the same materials used for the

Art Unit: 1772

radiation cured coating (i.e. acrylates, col. 9, lines 11-19) and the marking material (ink, col. 5, lines 39-40). MPEP 2112.01

The substrate comprises a noncellulosic organic polymeric surface comprising a retroreflective sheeting (col. 7, lines 41-66).

The retroreflective sheeting is deemed to be part of a validation sticker, since the retroreflective sheet, i.e. base sheet, is adhesively adhered to the surface of a document (col. 5, lines 42-44).

The marking material may comprise a second ink formulations comprising a colorant and a binder and the binder comprises a polymer selected from the group of a polyester, a vinyl, a polyolefin, a polyvinyl acetal, an alkyl or aryl substituted arcylate or methacrylate, a copolymer of ethylene or propylene with acrylic acid, methacrylic acid, or vinyl acetate, and combinations thereof (col. 13, lines 1-6).

The uv-curable composition comprises an acrylate (col. 9, lines 11-19).

The limitation "radiation cured coating is pattern coated" is a method limitation and does not determine the patentability of the product, unless the process produces unexpected results. The method of forming the product is not germane to the issue of patentability of the product itself, unless Applicant presents evidence from which the Examiner could reasonably conclude that the claimed product differs in kind from those of the prior art. MPEP 2113. Furthermore, there does not appear to be a difference between the prior art structure and the structure resulting from the claimed method because Lu discloses a radiation cured coating on a substrate.

The signage articles does not include a protective coating over the material (figure 2).

Art Unit: 1772

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments in the response filed May 18, 2004 regarding the previous rejections of record have been considered but are most due to the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Chevalier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1490. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Chevalier

6/12/05